IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 12562 of 2000

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

IBRAHIM @ IBHLO MOHAMMED KHALIFA

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MR MM TIRMIZI for Petitioner

MR LR POOJARI, AGP, for Respondent No. 1, 2, 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

Date of decision: 26/04/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. District Magistrate, Rajkot, passed an order on September 10, 2000, in exercise of powers under Section 3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 ("PASA Act" for short), detaining the petitioner under the provisions of the said Act.

2. The detaining authority took into consideration five offences registered against the petitioner, so also the statements of three anonymous witnesses. The detaining authority considered the activities of the detenu as that of a dangerous person as defined under the PASA Act and observed that the petitioner is required to be immediately prevented from pursuing his activities, which are detrimental to public order. The authority also considered the possibility of resorting to less drastic remedies and came to conclusion that detention under PASA Act is the only remedy that can be resorted to.

3. The petitioner challenges the order of detention on various grounds. Mr. Tirmizi, learned advocate appearing for the petitioner, has restricted his arguments to the ground that there is improper exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act. He has drawn attention of this Court to the fact that the statements of anonymous witnesses are not verified the detaining authority, but they have been verified by the Dy.S.P. and Special Divisional Magistrate, Morbi. He submitted that the detaining authority itself has not verified the genuineness of the fear expressed by the witnesses qua the detenu. Mr.Tirmizi submitted further that the offences registered against the detenu do not indicate any disturbance to public order and, therefore, the subjective satisfaction recorded by the detaining authority regarding the activities of the detenu being detrimental to public order is without any basis and the petition may, therefore, be allowed.

4. Mr. Poojari, learned Assistant Government Pleader, has opposed this petition.

5. Considering rival side contentions, it appears that the statements of anonymous witnesses have been verified by the Dy.S.P. and Special Divisional Magistrate, Morbi and not by the detaining authority. There is nothing to indicate that there was any communication between the Special Divisional Magistrate and the detaining authority and there is no contemporaneous material to indicate that the exercise undertaken by the detaining authority for arriving at a conclusion that the fear expressed by the witnesses and the statements are correct and genuine. The detaining authority has to take into consideration the background, the antecedents, the character, etc. of the detenu while considering the need for exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act. The authority has to scale the

right of the detenu of making an effective representation on the one hand and the public interest on the other and has to strike a balance between the two. The detaining authority has not filed any affidavit nor is there any contemporaneous material to indicate undertaking of such exercise by the detaining authority and, therefore, the exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act can be taken to have vitiated. No reliance, therefore, can be placed on these statements for sustaining the order of detention. There is improper exercise of powers under Section 9(2), as there is no material to indicate the exercise as stated above (Bai Amina v. State of Gujarat & Ors., 1981 GLR 1186 and Kalidas Chandubhai Kahar v. State of Gujarat & Ors., 1993(2) GLR 1659).

6. Adverting to the offences registered against the detenu, a perusal of the First Information Report and the other relevant documents supplied to the detenu makes it abundantly clear that out of the five offences one relates to theft. Out of the other four, two relate to causing simple hurt and intimidation, one relates to robbery and another one relates to use of criminal fear with an intention outrage the modesty of a women. On perusal of the papers, there is nothing to indicate any disturbance to public order and each of the case is of an individual character. All that was involved was a law and order situation. Resultantly, the satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority about the activities of the detenu being detrimental to public order is without any basis. Neither the statements nor the registered offences an be accepted to form the basis of this satisfaction.

7. In view of the above discussion, the reliance placed on by the detaining authority on the statements of anonymous witnesses and the registered offences cannot be upheld. The order of detention as well as the continued detention both are rendered bad in law. The petition, therefore, deserves to be allowed.

7. In the result, the petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated September 10, 2000, passed against the detenu is hereby quashed. The detenu-Ibrahim @ Ibhlo Mohammed Khalifa is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other matter. Rule is made absolute with no orders as to costs.

8. Direct service is permitted.

[A.L. DAVE, J.]

gt